

# Quantum lower bound for the collision problem

Samuel Kutin\*

February 9, 2008

## Abstract

We extend Shi's 2002 quantum lower bound for collision in  $r$ -to-one functions with  $n$  inputs. Shi's bound of  $\Omega((n/r)^{1/3})$  is tight, but his proof applies only in the case where the range has size at least  $3n/2$ . We give a modified version of Shi's argument which removes this restriction.

## 1 Introduction

How many quantum queries does it take to find a collision? Many cryptographic systems depend on the difficulty of finding collisions, so it is important to understand how difficult this problem may prove for a quantum computer.

Obviously, it may be easier to find collisions in some functions than others. We are interested in a *black-box* argument: our only access to the function is as a quantum oracle. We are promised that the function is  $r$ -to-one. (We require that  $r$  be a divisor of  $n$ , the size of the input space.) Brassard, Høyer, and Tapp [3] gave a quantum algorithm which requires  $O((n/r)^{1/3})$  quantum queries, an improvement over the  $\Theta((n/r)^{1/2})$  classical queries needed. In this note, we are concerned with the matching lower bound.

For a lower bound, it is easier to consider a decision problem: the input function is guaranteed to be either one-to-one or  $r$ -to-one, and our task is to determine which case holds. Aaronson [1] proved the first significant lower bound:  $\Omega((n/r)^{1/5})$  queries.

More recently, Shi [6] proved a lower bound of  $\Omega((n/r)^{1/3})$ , given the additional condition that the size of the range of the function is at least  $3n/2$ . (In the case where the range is only  $n$ , Shi provides a lower bound of  $\Omega((n/r)^{1/4})$ ). Shi's proof is a novel application of the methods of Nisan and Szegedy [4] to the case where one cannot fully symmetrize the multivariate polynomials.

Our main result is a new version of Shi's theorem, but without the additional constraint on the size of the range:

**Theorem 1** Let  $n > 0$  and  $r \geq 2$  be integers with  $r \mid n$ , and let a function from  $[n]$  to  $[n]$  be given as an oracle with the promise that it is either one-to-one or

---

\*Center for Communications Research, 805 Bunn Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540. Email: [kutin@idacccr.org](mailto:kutin@idacccr.org).

$r$ -to-one. Then any quantum algorithm for distinguishing these two cases must evaluate the function  $\Omega((n/r)^{1/3})$  times.

The argument is very similar to that of Shi. As stated above, we remove the requirement that the range be at least  $3n/2$ . Our proof is conceptually simpler for other reasons:

1. The natural automorphism group on the set of functions from  $[n]$  to  $[N]$  is  $S_n \times S_N$ . Our argument symmetrizes with respect to the entire group.
2. We avoid the explicit introduction of the problem Half- $r$ -to-one.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Functions as quantum oracles.

Let  $n, N > 0$  be integers. Let  $\mathcal{F}(n, N)$  be the set of functions from  $[n]$  to  $[N]$ .

Our functions are given to us as a quantum oracle. We can perform a transformation  $O_f$ , which applies  $f$  to the contents of some of the quantum state:

$$O_f |i, j, z\rangle = |i, f(i) + j \pmod{N}, z\rangle.$$

Here  $z$  is a placeholder for the unaffected portion of the quantum state.

The query complexity of a quantum algorithm is the number of times it calls  $O_f$ . We think of our algorithm as alternating between  $T + 1$  unitary operators and  $T$  applications of  $O_f$ .

Let  $\delta_{i,j}(f)$  be 1 when  $f(i) = j$ . Then, after  $T$  queries, the amplitude of each quantum base state is a degree- $T$  polynomial in these  $\delta_{i,j}(f)$ . Hence, the acceptance probability  $P(f)$  is a polynomial over  $\delta_{i,j}$  of degree at most  $2T$ . This connection between quantum complexity and polynomial degree is due to Beals, et al. [2].

Note that this polynomial  $P(f)$  is constrained to be in the interval  $[0, 1]$  whenever the  $\delta_{i,j}$  correspond to a valid input; i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i, j, \quad & \delta_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \\ \forall i, \quad & \sum_j \delta_{i,j} = 1 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The connection between polynomial degree and query complexity was first made by Nisan and Szegedy [4]. In their applications, they symmetrized over all permutations of the variables, reducing the multivariate polynomial to a univariate polynomial. They then apply results from approximation theory to prove a lower bound on the degree of the polynomial. Beals, et al. [2] followed the same approach.

A nice, general version of the approximation theory results was shown by Paturi [5]. Following Shi [6], we use a slight modification of Paturi's theorem:

**Theorem 2 (Paturi)** Let  $q(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}[\alpha]$  be a polynomial of degree  $d$ . Let  $a$  and  $b$  be integers,  $a < b$ , and let  $\xi \in [a, b]$  be a real number. If

1.  $|q(i)| \leq c_1$  for all integers  $i \in [a, b]$ , and
2.  $|q(\lfloor \xi \rfloor) - q(\xi)| \geq c_2$  for some constant  $c > 0$ ,

then

$$d = \Omega(\sqrt{(\xi - a + 1)(b - \xi + 1)}),$$

where the hidden constant depends on  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ .

Note that, if the conditions of the theorem are met for any  $\xi$ , we have  $d = \Omega(\sqrt{b - a})$ . If they are met for some  $\xi \approx (a + b)/2$ , then  $d = \Omega(b - a)$ .

In our setting, the automorphism group for the variables  $\delta_{i,j}$  is  $S_n \times S_N$ . If we symmetrize with respect to this group, we do not immediately obtain a univariate polynomial. Hence, we will have to work harder to apply Theorem 2.

For  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,  $\tau \in S_N$ , we define  $\Gamma_\tau^\sigma: \mathcal{F}(n, N) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(n, N)$  by

$$\Gamma_\tau^\sigma(f) = \tau \circ f \circ \sigma.$$

Let  $P(f)$  be an acceptance polynomial as above. We can write  $P$  as a sum  $\sum_S C_S I_S(f)$ , where  $S$  ranges over subsets of  $[n] \times [N]$ , and

$$I_S = \prod_{(i,j) \in I_S} \delta_{i,j}.$$

By (1), we may assume that each pair  $(i, j) \in S$  has a distinct value of  $i$ ; we thus write

$$I_S = \prod_{k=1}^t \prod_{i \in S_k} \delta_{i,j_k}, \quad (2)$$

where the sets  $S_k$  are disjoint, and  $\sum_k |S_k|$  is the degree of the monomial.

## 2.2 Some special functions

We now define a collection of functions which are  $a$ -to-one on part of the domain, and  $b$ -to-one on the rest of the domain. (These will enable us to interpolate between one-to-one and  $r$ -to-one functions.)

Fix  $N \geq n > 0$ . We say that a triple  $(m, a, b)$  of integers is *valid* if  $0 \leq m \leq n$ ,  $a \mid m$ , and  $b \mid (n - m)$ . For any such valid triple, we have a function  $f_{m,a,b} \in \mathcal{F}(n, N)$ , given by

$$f_{m,a,b} = \begin{cases} \lceil i/a \rceil & 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ N - \lfloor (n - i)/b \rfloor & m < i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

So  $f_{m,a,b}$  is  $a$ -to-one on  $m$  points, and  $b$ -to-one on the remaining  $n - m$  points. (Since  $N \geq n$ , the two parts of the range do not overlap.)

Note that our  $f_{m,a,b}$  plays the same role as Shi's  $f_{m,g}$ , with  $a = g$  and  $b = 2$ .

We now examine the behavior of  $f_{m,a,b}$  after we symmetrize by all of  $S_n \times S_N$ .

**Lemma 3** Let  $P(f)$  be a degree- $d$  polynomial in  $\delta_{i,j}$ . For a valid triple  $(m, a, b)$ , define  $Q(m, a, b)$  by

$$Q(m, a, b) = \mathbf{E}_{\sigma, \tau} [P(\Gamma_{\tau}^{\sigma}(f_{m,a,b}))].$$

Then  $Q$  is a degree- $d$  polynomial in  $m, a, b$ .

**Definition 4** For integers  $k, \ell$ , let  $\ell^{\bar{k}}$  denote the falling power  $\ell(\ell-1)\cdots(\ell-k+1)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 3:** It suffices to prove the lemma in the case where  $P$  is a monomial  $I_S$ . We write  $I_S$  in the form (2); then  $d = |S|$ . We write  $s_k = |S_k|$ .

For each subset  $U \subseteq [t]$ , let  $A_U$  be the following event: for each  $k \in U$ ,  $\sigma^{-1}(j_k) \leq m/a$ ; for each  $k \notin U$ ,  $\sigma^{-1}(j_k) \geq N - (n-m)/b + 1$ .

Clearly the events  $A_U$  are disjoint. If  $I_S(\Gamma_{\tau}^{\sigma}(f_{m,a,b}))$  is nonzero, then every  $\sigma^{-1}(j_k)$  must lie in the range of  $f_{m,a,b}$ , so some event  $A_U$  must occur. Hence, we write

$$Q(m, a, b) = \sum_{U \subseteq [t]} \Pr(A_U) Q_U(m, a, b),$$

where

$$Q_U(m, a, b) = \mathbf{E}_{\sigma, \tau} [I_S(\Gamma_{\tau}^{\sigma}(f_{m,a,b})) \mid A_U].$$

Choose some  $U$ , and let  $u = |U|$ . Then  $\Pr(A_U)$  is given by

$$\Pr(A_U) = \frac{\left(\frac{m}{a}\right)^{\bar{u}} \left(\frac{n-m}{b}\right)^{\bar{t-u}}}{N^{\bar{t}}},$$

which is a rational function in  $m, a, b$ . The numerator has degree  $t$ , and the denominator is  $a^u b^{t-u}$ .

Also,

$$Q_U(m, a, b) = \frac{1}{n^{\bar{s}}} \prod_{k \in U} a^{\bar{s}_k} \prod_{k \notin U} b^{\bar{s}_k}.$$

This is a polynomial in  $a, b$  of degree  $d$ ; furthermore  $Q_U$  is divisible by  $a^u b^{t-u}$ .

Hence, for each  $U$ ,  $\Pr(A_U) Q_U$  is a degree- $d$  polynomial in  $m, a, b$ . Therefore  $Q(m, a, b)$  is itself a degree- $d$  polynomial. This concludes the lemma.  $\blacksquare$

### 3 Main Proof

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 1:** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algorithm which distinguishes one-to-one from  $r$ -to-one in  $T$  queries, and let  $P(f)$  be the corresponding acceptance

probability.  $P(f)$  is a polynomial in  $\delta_{i,j}$  of degree at most  $2T$ . Let  $Q(m, a, b)$  be formed from  $P$  as in Lemma 3, and let  $d = \deg Q$ ; we have  $d \leq 2T$ .

For any  $\sigma, \tau$ , we know that  $\Gamma_\tau^\sigma(f_{m,a,b})$  is a valid function. If  $a = b$ , this function is  $a$ -to-one. We conclude the following:

1.  $0 \leq Q(m, a, b) \leq 1$  whenever  $(m, a, b)$  is a valid triple.
2.  $0 \leq Q(m, 1, 1) \leq 1/3$  for any  $m$ .
3.  $2/3 \leq Q(m, r, r) \leq 1$  for any  $m$  where  $r \mid m$ .

The remainder of the proof consists of proving that  $\deg Q = \Omega(n/r)^{1/3}$ . For simplicity of exposition, we begin with the case  $r = 2$ .

Let  $M = 2\lfloor n/4 \rfloor$ . We ask: is  $Q(M, 1, 2) \geq 1/2$ ? In other words: does our algorithm accept (at least half the time) an input which is one-to-one on half the domain, and two-to-one on the other half?

Case I:  $Q(M, 1, 2) \geq 1/2$ . Let  $c$  be the least integer for which  $|Q(M, 1, c)| \geq 2$ . Then we have  $Q(M, 1, x)$  between  $-2$  and  $2$  for all positive integers  $x < c$ , and  $|Q(M, 1, 1) - Q(M, 1, 2)| \geq 1/6$ . By Theorem 2, we have  $d = \Omega(\sqrt{c})$ .

Now, we consider the polynomial  $h(i) = Q(ci, 1, c)$ . For any integer  $i$  in the range  $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor n/c \rfloor$ , we have  $0 \leq h(i) \leq 1$ . But  $|h(M/c)| \geq 2$ . We conclude, by Theorem 2, that  $d = \Omega(n/c)$ .

Case II:  $Q(M, 1, 2) < 1/2$ . Now, let  $c$  be the least even integer for which  $|Q(M, c, 2)| \geq 2$ . As in Case I, we first get  $d = \Omega(\sqrt{c})$ . Then, by considering  $h(i) = Q(ci, c, 2)$ , we obtain  $d = \Omega(n/c)$ .

In either case, by combining  $d = \Omega(\sqrt{c})$  and  $d = \Omega(n/c)$ , we get  $d^3 = \Omega(n)$ , or  $d = \Omega(n^{1/3})$ .

For general  $r$ , the setup is almost identical: we now split into cases based on whether  $Q(m, 1, r) \geq 1/2$ ? (Note that, in Case II, we let  $c$  be the least multiple of  $r$  for which  $Q(M, c, r) \geq 2$ .) We first get  $d = \Omega(\sqrt{c/r})$ , and then  $d = \Omega(n/c)$ , yielding  $d = \Omega((n/r)^{1/3})$ . ■

## References

- [1] Scott Aaronson. Quantum lower bound for the collision problem. In *Proc. of the 34th ACM STOC*, pages 635–642, 2002.
- [2] Bob Beals, Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, Michele Mosca, and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum lower bounds by polynomials. In *Proc. of the 39th IEEE FOCS*, pages 352–361, 1998.
- [3] Gilles Brassard, Peter Høyer, and Alain Tapp. *Quantum algorithm for the collision problem*, volume 1380 of *Lecture Notes in CS*, pages 163–169. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [4] Noam Nisan and Márió Szegedy. On the degree of boolean functions as real polynomials. *Computational Complexity*, 4:301–313, 1994.

- [5] Ramamohan Paturi. On the degree of polynomials that approximate symmetric boolean functions. In *Proc. of the 24th ACM STOC*, pages 468–474, 1992.
- [6] Yaoyun Shi. Quantum lower bounds for the collision and the element distinctness problems. quantu-ph/0112086.